



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,497	09/16/2003	James M. Okuley	42P17870	4690
8791	7590	12/27/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			YACOB, SISAY	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2635

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/664,497	OKULEY, JAMES M.
	Examiner Sisay Yacob	Art Unit 2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date October 17, 2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1 The application of Okuley "Electronic devices and systems" filed on September 16, 2003 been examined.

Claims 1- 14 are pending

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3 Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent of Shiga et al., (6,522,283).

4 As to claim 1, Shiga et al., discloses an input device (Col. 1, lines 1-6-12, 63-67) comprising a housing (See figure 1), a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control (Col. 3, lines 20-21) and a second set of keys accessible on the

outer surface of the housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2).

5 As to claim 2, the input device of claim 1, further, Shiga et al., discloses a third set of keys associated with control of a television (Col. 3, lines 18-20).

6 As to claim 3, the input device of claim 1, further, Since Shiga et al., discloses the input device having function keys for performing input control of an information processing device, it is inherent, the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2).

7 As to claim 4, the input device of claim 1, further, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a keyboard (See figure 1).

8 As to claim 5, the input device of claim 1, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a remote control (Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 4-6).

9 Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent of Wang et al., (6,366,452).

10 As to claim 6, Wang et al., discloses an electronic system (Item 30 figure 2), comprising a pedestal base that has an enclosure mounted to the pedestal base, a flat panel display disposed within the enclosure, and a housing mounted on the pedestal base behind the display, the housing enclosing a processor-based system (Col. 2, lines 37-67).

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12 Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent of Wang et al. (6,366,452) in view of US patent of Evanicky et al. (6,243,068).

13 As to claim 7, the electronic system of claim 6, however, Wang et al., does not expressly discloses a pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display. In the field of flat panel display, Evanicky et al., discloses a pair of speakers that are disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display (See figure 1).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the electronic system of Wang et al., by incorporating a pair of speakers, as taught by Evanicky et al., in order to have a pair of speakers

disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display, because Evanicky et al., discloses a flat panel display that may be used with a variety of electronic devices that incorporates a pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display and one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes having the pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display saves space and improves the audio output distribution quality into the surrounding.

14 Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., in view of Evanicky et al., and in further view of US publication of Herrmann et al., (20020124271).

15 As to claim 8, the electronic system of claim 7, however, the combination of Wang et al. and Evanicky et al. does not expressly disclose a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base. In the field of interactive media terminal, Herrmann et al. discloses a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base (Page 2, Par. 0017, lines 1-5; Item 262 of figure 2).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the electronic system of the combination of Wang et al. and Evanicky et al., by incorporating subwoofer, as taught by Herrmann et al., in order to have an electronic system that has a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base, because Herrmann et al., discloses a system for a media display that may

be used with a variety of electronic devices that incorporates a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base and one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes having the pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display saves space and improves the audio output distribution quality into the surrounding.

16 As to claim 9, the electronic system of claim 7, further, Herrmann et al., discloses a subwoofer disposed in the housing (Page 2, Par. 0019, lines 3-6; Item 292 of figure 2).

17 Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., in view of Shiga et al.

18 As to claim 10, the system of claim 6, however, Wang et al., does not expressly discloses a wireless input device comprising a second housing, a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the second housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the second housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation. Shiga et al., discloses a wireless input device (Col. 1, lines 1-6-12, 63-67) comprising a housing (See figure 1), a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the second housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control (Col. 3, lines

20-21), and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the second housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the system for an electronic device of Wang et al., by incorporating the wireless input device, as taught by Shiga et al., in order to have a system for an electronic that has a wireless input device comprising a second housing, a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the second housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the second housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation, because Wang et al., discloses a system for an electronic display device that may be used as all-in-one display (Col. 1, lines 18-33) and Shiga et al., discloses a wireless input device that may be used as all-in-one wireless input device for a variety of electronic devices.

19 As to claim 11, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the input device further includes a third set of keys associated with control of a television (Col. 3, lines 18-20).

20 As to claim 12, the system of claim 10, further, Since Shiga et al., discloses the input device having function keys for performing input control of an information processing device, it is inherent, the second set of keys includes a

key associated with opening a file folder on a computer (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2).

21 As to claim 13, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a wireless keyboard (See figure 1).

22 As to claim 14, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a remote control (Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 4-6).

Conclusion

23 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following cited art is further to show the state of art related to Device and method for improved text entry on an alphanumeric keypad.

24 In the US patent (6,546,298) of "Speaker apparatus and a computer system incorporating same," Bull discloses a multi-media personal computer system that is capable of providing visual and audio recording and playback that incorporate an internal subwoofer.

25 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sisay Yacob whose telephone number is

(571) 272-8562. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on (571) 272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sisay Yacob

12/15/2005

S.Y.

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

